οk

who is the doctor on the team?

Reply Separator
Subject: Re: Re[2]: Merck-Medco
Ruthor: Paul Goldenhcim/PHARMA at NotesPO
Date: 1/16/97 9:22 PM

We have a lot going on in this area, but we are swamped. I don't think we need a separate team, but I am certainly willing to discuss. For the bup patch this is being done prospectively. For Oxy we are doing this both prospectively and retrospectively. A lot is underway. However, I am beginning to wonder if we should add a second MD to'the OxyContin effort. The program is getting too large with pharmacoeconomics, post-op (in label and for changing the label), and the massive noncancer pain program. We have a tiger by the tail, and I wonder if we should add more muscle. Let's discuss over live sushil

Michael Friedman at NORWALK @ CCMAIL 01/15/97 07:35 PM

To: Paul Goldenheim/PHARMA Subject: Re[2]: Merck-Medco

New Forward Item:

------ Forwarded with Changes ------

From: Michael Fricoman Date: 1/15/97 3:09AM \*To: Dr Richard Sackler at NORWALK

Subject: Re[2]: Merck-Medco

New Text Itcm: Re: Merck-Medco

Sorry, this was intended for you as well as Richard.

MF

Forward Header

Subject: Re[2]: Mcrck-Medco Author: Michael Friedman at NORWALK Date: 1/15/97 3:09 AM

We can deal with addiction separately, however, we cannot avoid the main point here. We will need pharmacoeconomic studies to stay in business.

If we do not do them, I can promise you that we will eventually be shut out

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

PDD9520801623

by the HMOs.

This is a serious matter that we cannot ignore and that we must discuss. We need these studies for Oxy and ALL FUTURE PRODUCTS. We cannot go on ignoring the reality of managed care and their economic proof requirements. I urge you and Paul to put in place an adequate rather than token budget and effort to get this stuff underway asap.

.

T, who am usually averse to teams, would suggest that we even consider a special phirmaco economic studies team. This is not an option. If we are to stay in business we need this proof of economic performance.

\_ Reply Separator

Subject: Re: Merck-Medco

Author: Dr Richard Sackler at NORWALK Date: 1/14/97 10:20 PM

Why don't you guys plan a presentation about addiction that could be given first by RR or BK and eventually by our senior managed health care people.

I think that Paul has a good point, but we should consider that "addiction" may be a convenient way to "just say 'NO'" and when this objection is obliterated, they will fall back on the question of cost.

Unless we can give a convincing presentation that C.x. products are less prone to addiction potential, abuse or diversion than i.r. products. I think that this can be done, but I defer to BK and RR and other experts.

\_ Forward Header

Subject: Re: Merck-Medco

Author: Paul Goldenheim/PHARMA at NotesPO Date: 1/14/97 2:42 PM

I am in agreement ( I believe that we all are) that this area is very important, and we have a number of plans underway -- new trials, completed trials, and retrospective examinations of older data. However, the EMmil that started this, I think, has little to do with pharmacoeconmics. We need to talk to Medco and others about addiction. In this regard, we have a strong PI and can bring a lot of experience and information to the

(Embedded

Dr Richard Sackler at NORWALK @ CCMAIL 01/11/97 08:27 PM

image moved to file:

FICOOL.PCX)

To: Paul Goldenheim/PHARMA, Michael Friedman at NORWALK @ CCMAIL
cc: Robert Reder/PHARMA, Susan Rosen/PHARMA, Ron Fitzmartin/PHARMA,
William Mallin/PHARMA, Dr Robert Kaiko at NORWALK @ CCMAIL, Ellen
Ingber at NORWALK2 @ CCMAIL
Subject: Re: Merck-Medco

3

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

PDD9520801624